

## REMARKS

Applicants have cancelled claim 3 and amended claim 2.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0040645 (Yamazaki) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,869,929 (Eida). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 1 states that the white electroluminescent emissive layer is disposed continuously over the red, green and blue pixels. The Examiner admits that Yamazaki does not disclose the claimed continuous EL emissive layer and contends that persons of ordinary skill in the art would have introduced Eida's light emitting layer 54, which the Examiner equates to the claimed continuous EL emissive layer, to Yamazaki's display device to produce the claimed EL display device. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Eida teaches an EL display in which the distance  $d_2$  between isolated EL emissive layers 31, which corresponds to the width of shielding layers 21, is larger than or equal to the distance  $d_1$  between the plane of the EL emissive layers 31 and the plane of color conversion material 2 comprised of color conversion layers 22 and the shielding layers 21, i.e.,  $d_2 \geq d_1$ , so that lights coming from neighboring isolated EL emissive layers 31 do not mix. The mixing of the lights among pixels makes the viewing angle narrower but can be reduced by Eida's structure. See, for example, column 5, lines 12-25 and FIG. 1a of Eida.

Eida's light emitting layer 54 shown in FIG. 15 of Eida, which the Examiner equates to the claimed continuous EL emissive layer, does cover more than one pixel. However, Eida states that the structure shown in FIG. 15 is an undesirable prior art structure. See column 2, lines 1-7, of Eida. Persons of ordinary skill in the art would have known that making the EL emissive layer continuous over the pixels would make the distance  $d_2$  equal to zero and thus cannot meet the required condition  $d_2 \geq d_1$ . Even if the width of the shielding layer 21 did not change in response to the change in the distance between the isolated EL emissive layers, a continuous EL emissive layer would increase the mixing of the lights among the pixels because it would angle the lights escaping from the color conversion layers 22. Thus, persons of ordinary skill in the art

would not have been motivated to combine the teachings of Eida and Yamazaki without an articulated motivation to do so, such that one positioning process step is removed by this device design, as explained at page 4, lines 14-17, of the specification.

The Examiner contends that the motivation to combine the teachings of Eida and Yamazaki is “to improve the characteristics in the angle of view.” See page 3 of the Action. However, making the EL emissive layer continuous would make “the angle of view” narrower and thus not desirable according to Eida, as explained above. The Examiner also points to column 18, lines 28-31, without any explanation. This passage of Eida states “There are no limitations to an emitting layer providing a white emitting light.” However, what Eida means by “no limitations” is that there are no limitations on the material selection of the emitting layer as described at column 18, lines 32-58 of Eida, and it says nothing about the shape or physical dimensions of the emitting layer.

The rejection of claim 1 under 35 USC 103(a) over Yamazaki and Eida should be withdrawn because the Examiner has failed to carry her burden to provide evidence to support her combining the teachings of Yamazaki and Eida.

Claim 2 has been amended to include the same claim limitation as discussed above and thus should be allowable because Yamazaki, Eida and Osawa together do not teach or suggest that claim limitation. Claim 3 has been cancelled, and claim 2 has been also amended to correct inadvertent mistakes.

In light of the above, a Notice of Allowance is solicited.

In the event that the transmittal letter is separated from this document and the Patent and Trademark Office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicants petition

for any required relief including extensions of time and authorize the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to  
**Deposit Account No. 03-1952**, referencing Docket No. **492322015800**.

Dated: December 28, 2005

By:

Respectfully submitted,



Barry E. Bretschneider  
Registration No. 28,055

Morrison & Foerster LLP  
1650 Tysons Boulevard, Suite 300  
McLean, VA 22102-3915  
Telephone: (703) 760-7743  
Facsimile: (703) 760-7777